

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**Case No. 5:24-cv-02063-KK-PD

Date: June 6, 2025

Title Valerie Flores v. Amber Vang, et. al.Present: The Honorable: Patricia Donahue, United States Magistrate Judge

Isabel Verduzco
Deputy ClerkN/A
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

N/A

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

N/A

**Proceedings (In Chambers): Order to Show Cause Why the Complaint
Should Not be Dismissed as Duplicative****I. Background**

On August 23, 2024, Plaintiff Valerie Flores (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed the Complaint. [Dkt. No. 1.] On May 21, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request to proceed without prepayment of fees. [Dkt. No. 28.]

II. Legal Standard

The Court is required to screen pro se complaints and dismiss claims that, among other things, are frivolous, malicious, or fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). A complaint may be dismissed as frivolous if it merely “repeats pending or previously litigated claims.” Cato v. United States, 70 F.3d 1103, 1105 n.2 (9th Cir. 1995) (citations and internal quotations omitted). “A duplicative action, arising from the same series of events and alleging many of the same facts as an earlier suit may be dismissed as frivolous or malicious under Section 1915(e).” Lewis v. Ugwueme, 2020 WL 5899515, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sep. 9, 2020). “Dismissal of the duplicative lawsuit, more so than the issuance of a stay or

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:24-cv-02063-KK-PD

Date: June 6, 2025

Title Valerie Flores v. Amber Vang, et. al.

the enjoinder of proceedings, promotes judicial economy and the comprehensive disposition of litigation.” Adams v. California, 487 F.3d 684, 688 (9th Cir. 2007).

III. Discussion

This is one of three pending cases filed by Plaintiff in this district. The others are Flores v. Vang, Case No. 5:24-cv-01347-MWC-PD and Flores v. California Highway Patrol, Case No. 5:25-cv-00203-MWC-PD.

This case is substantively identical to Flores v. Vang, Case No. 5:24-cv-01347-MWC-PD, in which Plaintiff raises the same claims against almost all of the same defendants and alleges an almost identical set of facts. As such, this action is subject to dismissal as duplicative.

IV. Order

For the foregoing reasons, by **July 17, 2025**, Flores is ordered to show cause why the Court should not recommend that the Complaint be dismissed as duplicative. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

If, given the contents of this Order, Flores elects not to proceed in this action, she may expedite matters by signing and returning **the attached Notice of Dismissal by July 17, 2025**, which will result in the voluntary dismissal of this action without prejudice.

Flores is cautioned that, absent further order of the Court, her failure to timely file a response to this Order or Notice of Dismissal, may result in the dismissal of this action with or without prejudice on the grounds above or for failure to diligently prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Attachments:

--Notice of Voluntary Dismissal (CV-09)